

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 125

March 30, 1995, 9:56 p.m.  
Page S-4915 Temp. Record

## DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL-RESCISSIONS/Nuclear Waste Repository

**SUBJECT:** Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act . . . H.R. 1158. Domenici motion to table the Reid/Bryan amendment No. 438 to the Hatfield substitute amendment No. 420.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 77-17

**SYNOPSIS:** As introduced, H.R. 1158, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act, will provide \$5.360 billion in emergency appropriations for disaster assistance, and will rescind \$17.188 billion for various Departments and agencies.

The Hatfield substitute amendment would strike the provisions of H.R. 1158 and insert in lieu thereof the text of S. 617, as reported, which would provide \$6.700 billion in disaster assistance (the amount requested by the President), would rescind \$13.286 billion for various Departments and agencies, and would provide for expedited salvage timber sales on Federal lands for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

**The Reid/Bryan amendment** would transfer \$14.7 million of the funds raised from electric ratepayers for nuclear waste disposal to drug abuse block grants. (Ratepayers of utilities that produce electricity with nuclear energy are taxed by the Government to raise money to build a permanent nuclear waste repository; site characterizations for that repository are ongoing at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.)

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Domenici moved to table the Reid amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

The United States has 109 commercial nuclear reactors. By the year 2030, all these reactors will have completed their initial 40-year licenses. Their total cumulative discharge of radioactive waste will be 85,000 metric tons. That waste must be safely disposed of over the long term. With these facts in mind, Congress adopted the Nuclear Waste Policy Act in 1982, which placed a tax on the

(See other side)

YEAS (77)			NAYS (17)		NOT VOTING (6)	
Republicans (51 or 100%)	Democrats (26 or 60%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (17 or 40%)	Republicans (3)	Democrats (3)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka		Biden	Faircloth <sup>-2</sup>	Baucus <sup>-2</sup>
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Bingaman		Boxer	Grams <sup>-4</sup>	Conrad <sup>-2</sup>
Bennett	Jeffords	Bradley		Breaux	Kassebaum <sup>-4</sup>	Dorgan <sup>-2</sup>
Bond	Kempthorne	Bumpers		Bryan		
Brown	Kyl	Dodd		Byrd		
Burns	Lott	Exon		Daschle		
Campbell	Lugar	Feingold		Graham		
Chafee	Mack	Feinstein		Harkin		
Coats	McCain	Ford		Heflin		
Cochran	McConnell	Glenn		Mikulski		
Cohen	Murkowski	Hollings		Moynihan		
Coverdell	Nickles	Inouye		Pell		
Craig	Packwood	Johnston		Pryor		
D'Amato	Pressler	Kennedy		Reid		
DeWine	Roth	Kerrey		Rockefeller		
Dole	Santorum	Kerry		Sarbanes		
Domenici	Shelby	Kohl		Simon		
Frist	Simpson	Lautenberg			<b>EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:</b> 1—Official Buisness 2—Necessarily Absent 3—Illness 4—Other	
Gorton	Smith	Leahy				
Gramm	Snowe	Levin				
Grassley	Specter	Lieberman				
Gregg	Stevens	Moseley-Braun			<b>SYMBOLS:</b> AY—Announced Yea AN—Announced Nay PY—Paired Yea PN—Paired Nay	
Hatch	Thomas	Murray				
Hatfield	Thompson	Nunn				
Helms	Thurmond	Robb				
	Warner	Wellstone				

Compiled and written by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee—Don Nickles, Chairman

ratepayers of utilities that produce nuclear energy, with the proceeds to be used to develop a long-term storage facility.

The taxes raised are placed into a trust fund. Each year Congress appropriates the amount that it believes is needed from the fund to build the storage facility. This year Congress appropriated \$400 million. The trust fund balance was accordingly reduced by \$400 million. The Reid amendment would take \$14.7 million of this appropriated amount and use it for another purpose. The merits of the other purpose are entirely irrelevant--all that matters is that the effect of the Reid amendment would be to raid the nuclear waste repository trust fund which is paid for by ratepayers, not taxpayers. We did not place a surcharge on nuclear utility customers' use of electricity in order to pay for social programs, however meritorious; we placed that surcharge in order to raise money to dispose of nuclear waste. Any other use for the money raised would be unethical. We sympathize with the Senators from Nevada who have offered this amendment. If we were they, we too would not want to have all the Nation's nuclear waste buried in our State. However, we emphatically oppose the method they have chosen for trying to reduce funding for this nuclear waste repository, and thus urge the resounding rejection of their amendment.

**Those opposing** the motion to table contended:

This year \$400 million has been appropriated to dig a hole in the ground in Nevada. That amount is \$130 million more than was appropriated last year, and is more than will even be spent. At the same time, \$14.7 million was cut from the substance abuse block grant program. That program has had an incredible success rate. It saves lives and saves money. For example, in Nevada, substance abuse is a primary factor in 55 percent of child abuse cases. Accordingly, Nevada funded a program using block grant funding to provide intensive treatment to the abusive parents. The program accepts up to 42 families, at a cost of \$85,000 per year, and has a 90-percent success rate after 1 year of treatment. Absent this program, the State would have had to take the children from their parents and give them alternate care, at an average cost per child of \$40,000 per year. Thus, this substance abuse treatment program keeps families together and saves the State money. Similar treatment programs have been found to lower criminal recidivism rates, lower medical treatment costs, and keep at-risk kids in school. In every case, drug abuse treatment has proven to be less costly than paying for the attendant social costs of drug abusers. Some Senators say that the benefits of the block grant program are irrelevant to them because the source of the funding, the nuclear waste fund, is objectionable. They argue that money for the fund is raised only from electric ratepayers to build a nuclear storage dump, and should therefore only be used for that purpose. We doubt most ratepayers would agree if they were asked. We believe they would agree with us that it is more important to fund drug abuse treatment programs than it is to dig a hole in Nevada. We suspect, if they could vote, that they would join us in opposing this motion to table.